

## Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 143453  
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07  
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 TRSE-00 DODE-00  
H-01 NSC-05 CU-02 BIB-01 NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00  
INRE-00 /062 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:PBSWIERS  
APPROVED BY EUR/RPM:WSHINN, JR.  
ACDA/ISP/REG:RSTRAND (DRAFT)  
EUR/RPM:JKORNBLUM (INFO)  
OSD/ISA:TPHDUNLOP (DRAFT)  
PM/DCA:PSCHOETTLE (INFO)  
S/P:PKAPLAN  
EUR/WE:JDOBBINS (INFO)  
-----020379 210213Z /73

O R 210119Z JUN 77  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE  
AMEMBASSY PARIS  
INFO AMEMBASSY BELGRADE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 143453

BELGRADE FOR USDEL CSCE

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 21 POLADS MEETING

REFERENCES: (A) USNATO 5543 (NOTAL) (B) USNATO  
5468 (NOTAL) (C) USNATO 5381 (NOTAL) (D) USNATO 5367  
(E) USNATO 5227 (NOTAL) (F) STATE 136929 (G) STATE  
130422

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 143453

1. WE ARE, IN GENERAL, SATISFIED THAT ISD/149 AS AMENDED  
(REFTELS B AND E) HAS TIED TOGETHER IN ONE PAPER THE  
ALLIED CBMS POSITIONS AS AGREED TO DATE. WE HOPE  
THAT THE FINAL PRODUCT WILL ENABLE THE ALLIES TO ADOPT  
AND MAINTAIN A WELL-COORDINATED CBMS POSITION AT  
BELGRADE.

2. WE NOTE HERE SEEMINGLY POSITIVE TONE OF THE  
FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE'S RECENT STATEMENT ON CBMS  
(PARAGRAPH TWO OF REFTEL D). WE WOULD APPRECIATE

MISSION'S AND EMBASSY PARIS' VIEWS WHETHER THIS STATE-  
MENT MAY REPRESENT SOFTENING OF FRENCH POSITION  
ON CBM INITIATIVES. WE WOULD CONSIDER FRENCH  
WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE--IF ONLY TACITLY--WITH  
ALLIES ON CBMS, IN ADDITION TO OTHER CSCE BASKETS, A  
MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT.

3. WE AGREE WITH MISSION THAT ATTEMPT SHOULD BE MADE  
TO KEEP FOCUS OF JUNE 21 POLADS MEETING ON ISD/149  
AND AVOID BRINGING IN NEW NORWEGIAN PAPER (PARAGRAPH  
4 OF REFTEL C). IF PAPER SHOULD COME UP, HOWEVER,  
MISSION SHOULD STATE WE DO NOT REGARD IT AS DESIRABLE  
AT THIS POINT TO SEEK MANEUVER NOTIFICATION IN THE  
7-10,000 TROOP RANGE. IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, WE  
BELIEVE MILITARY COMMITTEE VIEWS ON IDEA SHOULD BE  
FULLY VETTED BEFORE WE TAKE A POSITION ON LOWERING  
THE NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD TO 7,000 TROOPS, A  
FIGURE WE DO NOT BELIEVE HAS YET BEEN THOROUGHLY STAFFED.  
A PARTICULAR POINT TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE MC IN  
THIS REGARD IS WHETHER ON BALANCE SUCH A LOWERING  
OF THE THRESHOLD WOULD RESULT IN A NET INCREASE IN  
THE NUMBER OF ALLIED NOTIFICATIONS COMPARED TO WP  
NOTIFICATIONS--WHICH WE DO NOT FAVOR. MOREOVER, WE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 143453

BELIEVE AN ATTEMPT TO LOWER THE THRESHOLD BELOW  
THE PRESENT 10,000 TROOP LEVEL WOULD BE SEEN AS  
AMENDING OF THE FINAL ACT, RATHER THAN STRENGTHENING

EXISTING CBM PROVISIONS, WHICH IS THE AGREED ALLIED  
POSITION.

4. FOLLOWING ARE OUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON ISD/149  
AS AMENDED:

(A) PAGE 3, PARAGRAPH 4, LINE 10: SUBSTITUTE "VERY  
GOOD" FOR "EXCELLENT". THE ALLIES' RECORD,  
FOR INSTANCE ON NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS AND INVITATIONS  
OF OBSERVERS, IS SUBJECT TO SOME CRITISM AND  
IMPROVEMENT.

(B) SINCE IT WAS IN QUOTATIONS, WE ASSUME THAT  
"ENCOURAGE" IN REVISED FIRST SENTENCE FOR PARAGRAPH  
FOUR ON PAGE THREE (FIRST CHANGE LISTED IN PARAGRAPH  
THREE OF REFTEL B) SHOULD READ "ENLARGE."

(C) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (III), LINES 4 AND 5: FOR  
CLARITY REVISE TO READ, "...THE ALLIES HAVE INVITED  
OBSERVERS TO FIVE MAJOR AND FIVE SMALLER-SCALE  
MANEUVERS."

(D) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (III): THERE HAS BEEN SOME  
CRITICISM BY NNAS OF ALLIED TREATMENT OF OBSERVERS.

THE APPROPRIATE APPENDIX SHOULD RECORD SUCH CRITICISM  
AS WE MAY BE AWARE OF. THE LOGICAL REPLY TO NNA

CRITICISM WOULD BE AN EXPRESSION OF WILLINGNESS TO  
SEEK AGREEMENT ON A CODE OF TREATMENT WHICH WOULD  
INSURE A MEANINGFUL OBSERVER EXPERIENCE.

(E) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (IV): BEFORE FINAL TICK,  
INSERT AN ADDITIONAL ONE READING, "--THE MOVEMENTS  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 143453

PROVISION IS NOT WELL DEFINED (THIS APPROACH WOULD  
REFLECT ANY ALLIED READINESS TO SEEK AGREEMENT  
ON A MORE PRECISE FORMULATION)."

(F) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (IV): WE WILL SEEK TO  
PROVIDE A SUGGESTED ALLIED RESPONSE TO ANY NNA CRITICISM O  
OF MOVEMENTS NON-COMPLIANCE AFTER WE HAVE WORKED OUT  
OUR PARAMETERS POSITION (SEE PARAGRAPH 2C OF REFTEL  
F).

(G) PAGE 7, PARAGRAPH 12: INSERT BEFORE THE WORDS  
"ALLIED COUNTRIES" IN THE FIRST SENTENCE THE PHRASE,  
"WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING SOME POSITIVE ELEMENTS IN THE  
EASTERN CBM IMPLEMENTATION RECORD,"

(H) PAGE 7, PARAGRAPH 13 (I), THIRD LINE: "MAN"  
SHOULD READ "TROOP" TO MAINTAIN LANGUAGE CONSISTENCY.  
ALSO CHANGE IN PAGE ELEVEN, PARAGRAPH 21(I).

(I) PAGE ELEVEN, PARAGRAPH 21 (II), SECOND LINE:  
WE WOULD SUGGEST ADDING "DEFINE SMALLER-SCALE

THRESHOLD (10-25,000 TROOPS)AND" BETWEEN "TO"  
AND "STRENGTHEN" TO REFLECT APPARENT ALLIED CONSENSUS  
THAT A LOWERING OF THE NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD WOULD  
STAND BETTER CHANCE THROUGH OPTION OF DEFINING THE  
MEANING OF SMALLER SCALE MANEUVERS.

(J) PAGE 13, THIRD TICK AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE:  
AFTER THE PHRASE "SUBSEQUENT MANEUVERS", ADD ", EVEN  
IF THE LATTER ARE NOT OF A SIZE TO REQUIRE NOTIFI-  
CATION UNDER THE MAJOR MANEUVERS NOTIFCATION CBM  
TO A MINIMUM OF 10,000." THIS MIGHT GO SOME WAY  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 143453

TOWARDS SATISFYING YUGOSLAVIAN INTEREST IN A MORE  
PRECISE DEFINITION OF THE NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT  
WHICH WOULD ENCOMPASS COORDINATED SERIES OF  
SMALLER MANEUVERS.

(K) PAGE 13, PARAGRAPH 28: LAST SENTENCE COULD NOW

READ: "AUTHORITIES OF ONE ALLIED COUNTRY (SOME ALLIED COUNTRIES?) HAVE INDICATED THEIR WILLINGNESS,

AT THIS TIME, TO SUPPORT IN PRINCIPLE AN INITIATIVE BY THE NNAS TO STRENGTHEN THE FINAL ACT PROVISION FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS, IF ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS FOR SUCH A PROPOSAL CAN BE DETERMINED

AND AGREED UPON. IF NNAS SHOULD OFFER ACCEPTABLY FORMULATED INITIATIVE THE ALLY (THESE ALLIES?) BELIEVES NATO SHOULD SUPPORT IT. IF INITIAL NNA PROPOSAL IS UNACCEPTABLE OR INADEQUATE, THIS ALLY (THESE ALLIES?) BELIEVE NATO SHOULD SUGGEST TO NNAS ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION WHICH IT (THEY?) COULD SUPPORT. ALTHOUGH THIS ALLY (THESE ALLIES?) SEE NO ADVANTAGE IN ALLIANCE ADVOCACY OF A MOVEMENTS CBM, IT (THEY?) RESERVE(S) ITS (THEIRS) POSITION ON QUESTION WHETHER UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO CONSIDER INITIATIVES ON MOVEMENTS THEMSELVES, AS SOME ALLIES PROPOSE.

(L) PAGE 14, PARAGRAPH 30: AT END OF SENTENCE, SUBSTITUTE COMMA FOR PERIOD AND ADD "SINCE FINAL ACT GAVE SPECIFIC RECOGNITION TO THIS POSSIBILITY, I.E., 'FURTHER CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN...TO THE QUESTION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MILITARY MOVEMENTS, BEARING IN MIND, IN PARTICULAR, THE EXPERIENCE GAINED BY THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MEASURES WHICH ARE SET FORTH IN THIS DOCUMENT'." CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 143453

(M) PAGE 14, PARAGRAPH 3, SUB-PARAGRAPH (II): DROP

"WARSAW PACT" FROM THE FIRST LINE.

(N) PAGE SIXTEEN, PARAGRAPH 34 (1); LAST SENTENCE: SUBSTITUTE "WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES" FOR "SOVIET UNION". YUGOSLAVIA DOES NOT HAVE A BORDER WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION.

(O) PAGE 28: REVISE FIRST LINE TO READ, "...PROPOSAL WERE ADOPTED, AND IF THERE WERE NO SIZE THRESHOLD OR A VERY SMALL ONE, THE ALLIES MIGHT HAVE TO

NOTIFY A..."; ADD THE WORD "ALONE" AFTER "MOVEMENTS" IN LINE FOUR.

(P) PAGE 20, SUB-PARAGRAPH (12): AFTER "NEUTRAL COUNTRIES" IN THE SECOND SENTENCE, INSERT ", EXCEPT

PERHAPS YUGOSLAVIA,".

(Q) PAGE 21, PARAGRAPH 37; LINE 13: FOR "CONCRETE",  
SUBSTITUTE "MORE AMBITIOUS ARMS CONTROL".

(R) PAGE 21, PARAGRAPH 37, FINAL SENTENCE: THIS  
SENTENCE IS ENTIRELY SPECULATIVE AND SHOULD BE  
DROPPED. FOLLOWING COULD BE SUBSTITUTED: "THE SOVIETS  
HAVE SHOWN SOME RECEPTIVITY TO THE POSSIBILITY  
OF STANDARDIZING TREATMENT OF OBSERVERS AND TO FURTHER  
DISCUSSION, AT SOME POINT, OF MOVEMENTS NOTIFICATION."

(S) PAGE 22, PARAGRAPH 40: IN LINE FOUR, REPLACE  
"OWN POOR" WITH "INFERIOR".  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 143453

(T) PAGE 22, PARAGRAPH 43: AT THE END OF THE FIRST  
SENTENCE ADD THE PHRASE ", AS THE YUGOSLAVS  
AND THE ROMANISNS IN PARTICULAR HAVE ADVOCATED."

(U) PAGE 22, PARAGRAPH 43: MISSION SHOULD RESERVE  
ITS POSITION ON LAST SENTENCE. FURTHER GUIDANCE WILL  
BE PROVIDED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

(V) "INITIATIVE(S)" SHOULD BE SUBSTITUTED FOR  
"PROPOSAL(S)" THROUGHOUT ISD/149 TO REFLECT CONCEPT  
PUT FORWARD IN PARAGRAPH F(2) OF REFTEL G.

(W) WE DO NOT WISH AT THIS POINT TO CUT OFF COMPLETELY  
THE POSSIBILITY OF USING THE STATISTICS REFERRED TO  
UNDER FOOTNOTE (1) ON PAGES FOUR, SEVEN AND 22. WE  
WOULD THEREFORE REQUEST:

(1) SUBSTITUTING "IS INTENDED" FOR "SHOULD SERVE";

(2) ADDING "PROBABLY" BETWEEN "....IMPLEMENTATION

AND" AND "SHOULD NOT BE USED...;"

(3) DELETING "-OR EVEN SHOWN AT THE CONFERENCE  
TABLE-" (FIRST PART OF SENTENCE MAKES POINT ADEQUATELY);  
AND

(4) SUBSTITUTING "MIGHT CAUSE" FOR "COULD CAUSE  
SERIOUS".

(5) PLEASE MAKE FOLLOWING REVISIONS TO ISD/149 ANNEX  
II ON MILITARY EXCHANGES; ALL ARE ON PAGE 3, OTHER  
VISITS (1977):

(A) SHIFT VISIT TO POSTON BY REAR ADMIRAL KALININ  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 143453

FROM 1977 TO 1975.

(B) DITTO WITH VISIT TO BOSTON BY SOVIET VESSELS  
BOYKIY AND ZHGOUCHIY

(C) DITTO WITH VISIT TO CONSTANTA BY USS WAINWRIGHT

(D) DITTO WITH VISIT TO LENINGRAD BY REAR ADMIRAL  
LANGILLE.

(E) DITTO WITH VISIT TO LENINGRAD BY USS LEAHY  
AND USS TATTNAL

(F) ADD TO 1977 LISTING FOLLOWING TWO VISITS:  
USA ROMANIA 1-6 MAY VISIT TO BUCHAREST BY NDU/ICAF DEL.

USA USSR 11-18 MAY VISIT TO MOSCOW BY NWC DELEGATION.

VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 09 STATE 143453

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE  
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /013 R

66011

DRAFTED BY:EUR/RPM:PBSWIERS

APPROVED BY:EUR/RPM:PBSWIERS

-----082815 160618Z /20

R 151820Z JUL 77

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY OSLO

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 143453

FOLLOWING REPEAT STATE 143453 ACTION USMISSION NATO, PARIS  
INFO BELGRADE JUN 21.

QUOTE C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 143453

BELGRADE FOR USDEL CSCE

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 21 POLADS MEETING

REFERENCES: (A) USNATO 5543 (NOTAL) (B) USNATO 5468 (NOTAL) (C) USNATO 5381 (NOTAL) (D) USNATO 5367 (E) USNATO 5227 (NOTAL) (F) STATE 136929 (G) STATE 130422

1. WE ARE, IN GENERAL, SATISFIED THAT ISD/149 AS AMENDED (REFTELS B AND E) HAS TIED TOGETHER IN ONE PAPER THE ALLIED CBMS POSITIONS AS AGREED TO DATE. WE HOPE THAT THE FINAL PRODUCT WILL ENABLE THE ALLIES TO ADOPT AND MAINTAIN A WELL-COORDINATED CBMS POSITION AT CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE

BELGRADE.

2. WE NOTE HERE SEEMINGLY POSITIVE TONE OF THE FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE'S RECENT STATEMENT ON CBMS (PARAGRAPH TWO OF REFTEL D). WE WOULD APPRECIATE MISSION'S AND EMBASSY PARIS' VIEWS WHETHER THIS STATEMENT MAY REPRESENT SOFTENING OF FRENCH POSITION ON CBM INITIATIVES. WE WOULD CONSIDER FRENCH WILLINGNESS TO COOPERATE--IF ONLY TACITLY--WITH ALLIES ON CBMS, IN ADDITION TO OTHER CSCE BASKETS, A MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT.

3. WE AGREE WITH MISSION THAT ATTEMPT SHOULD BE MADE TO KEEP FOCUS OF JUNE 21 POLADS MEETING ON ISD/149 AND AVOID BRINGING IN NEW NORWEGIAN PAPER (PARAGRAPH 4 OF REFTEL C). IF PAPER SHOULD COME UP, HOWEVER, MISSION SHOULD STATE WE DO NOT REGARD IT AS DESIRABLE AT THIS POINT TO SEEK MANEUVER NOTIFICATION IN THE 7-10,000 TROOP RANGE. IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, WE BELIEVE MILITARY COMMITTEE VIEWS ON IDEA SHOULD BE FULLY VETTED BEFORE WE TAKE A POSITION ON LOWERING THE NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD TO 7,000 TROOPS, A FIGURE WE DO NOT BELIEVE HAS YET BEEN THOROUGHLY STAFFED. A PARTICULAR POINT TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE MC IN THIS REGARD IS WHETHER ON BALANCE SUCH A LOWERING OF THE THRESHOLD WOULD RESULT IN A NET INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF ALLIED NOTIFICATIONS COMPARED TO WP NOTIFICATIONS--WHICH WE DO NOT FAVOR. MOREOVER, WE BELIEVE AN ATTEMPT TO LOWER THE THRESHOLD BELOW THE PRESENT 10,000 TROOP LEVEL WOULD BE SEEN AS AMENDING OF THE FINAL ACT, RATHER THAN STRENGTHENING

EXISTING CBM PROVISIONS, WHICH IS THE AGREED ALLIED  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE

POSITION.

4. FOLLOWING ARE OUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON ISD/149  
AS AMENDED:

(A) PAGE 3, PARAGRAPH 4, LINE 10: SUBSTITUTE "VERY  
GOOD" FOR "EXCELLENT". THE ALLIES' RECORD,  
FOR INSTANCE ON NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS AND INVITATIONS  
OF OBSERVERS, IS SUBJECT TO SOME CRITICISM AND  
IMPROVEMENT.

(B) SINCE IT WAS IN QUOTATIONS, WE ASSUME THAT  
"ENCOURAGE" IN REVISED FIRST SENTENCE FOR PARAGRAPH  
FOUR ON PAGE THREE(FIRST CHANGE LISTED IN PARAGRAPH  
THREE OF REFTEL B) SHOULD READ "ENLARGE."

(C) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (III), LINES 4 AND 5: FOR  
CLARITY REVISE TO READ, "....THE ALLIES HAVE INVITED  
OBSERVERS TO FIVE MAJOR AND FIVE SMALLER-SCALE  
MANEUVERS."

(D) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (III): THERE HAS BEEN SOME

CRITICISM BY NNAS OF ALLIED TREATMENT OF OBSERVERS.  
THE APPROPRIATE APPENDIX SHOULD RECORD SUCH CRITICISM  
AS WE MAY BE AWARE OF. THE LOGICAL REPLY TO NNA

CRITICISM WOULD BE AN EXPRESSION OF WILLINGNESS TO  
SEEK AGREEMENT ON A CODE OF TREATMENT WHICH WOULD  
INSURE A MEANINGFUL OBSERVER EXPERIENCE.

(E) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (IV): BEFORE FINAL TICK,  
INSERT AN ADDITIONAL ONE READING, "--THE MOVEMENTS  
PROVISION IS NOT WELL DEFINED (THIS APPROACH WOULD  
REFLECT ANY ALLIED READINESS TO SEEK AGREEMENT  
ON A MORE PRECISE FORMULATION)."

(F) PAGE 5, SUB-PARAGRAPH (IV): WE WILL SEEK TO  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE

PROVIDE A SUGGESTED ALLIED RESPONSE TO ANY NNA CRITICISM O  
OF MOVEMENTS NON-COMPLIANCE AFTER WE HAVE WORKED OUT  
OUR PARAMETERS POSITION (SEE PARAGRAPH 2C OF REFTEL  
F).

(G) PAGE 7, PARAGRAPH 12: INSERT BEFORE THE WORDS  
"ALLIED COUNTRIES" IN THE FIRST SENTENCE THE PHRASE,  
"WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING SOME POSITIVE ELEMENTS IN THE  
EASTERN CBM IMPLEMENTATION RECORD,"

(H) PAGE 7, PARAGRAPH 13 (I), THIRD LINE: "MAN"  
SHOULD READ "TROOP" TO MAINTAIN LANGUAGE CONSISTENCY.  
ALSO CHANGE IN PAGE ELEVEN, PARAGRAPH 21(I).



(I) PAGE ELEVEN, PARAGRAPH 21 (II), SECOND LINE:  
WE WOULD SUGGEST ADDING "DEFINE SMALLER-SCALE

THRESHOLD (10-25,000 TROOPS)AND" BETWEEN "TO"  
AND "STRENGTHEN" TO REFLECT APPARENT ALLIED CONSENSUS  
THAT A LOWERING OF THE NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD WOULD  
STAND BETTER CHANCE THROUGH OPTION OF DEFINING THE  
MEANING OF SMALLER SCALE MANEUVERS.

(J) PAGE 13, THIRD TICK AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE:  
AFTER THE PHRASE "SUBSEQUENT MANEUVERS", ADD ", EVEN  
IF THE LATTER ARE NOT OF A SIZE TO REQUIRE NOTIFI-  
CATION UNDER THE MAJOR MANEUVERS NOTIFICATION CBM  
TO A MINIMUM OF 10,000." THIS MIGHT GO SOME WAY  
TOWARDS SATISFYING YUGOSLAVIAN INTEREST IN A MORE  
PRECISE DEFINITION OF THE NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT  
WHICH WOULD ENCOMPASS COORDINATED SERIES OF  
SMALLER MANEUVERS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE

(K) PAGE 13, PARAGRAPH 28: LAST SENTENCE COULD NOW

READ: "AUTHORITIES OF ONE ALLIED COUNTRY (SOME  
ALLIED COUNTRIES?) HAVE INDICATED THEIR WILLINGNESS,

AT THIS TIME, TO SUPPORT IN PRINCIPLE AN INITIATIVE  
BY THE NNAS TO STRENGTHEN THE FINAL ACT PROVISION FOR  
NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS, IF ACCEPTABLE  
PARAMETERS FOR SUCH A PROPOSAL CAN BE DETERMINED

AND AGREED UPON. IF NNAS SHOULD OFFER ACCEPTABLY  
FORMULATED INITIATIVE THE ALLY (THESE ALLIES?)  
BELIEVES NATO SHOULD SUPPORT IT. IF INITIAL NNA  
PROPOSAL IS UNACCEPTABLE OR INADEQUATE, THIS ALLY  
(THESE ALLIES?) BELIEVE NATO SHOULD SUGGEST TO  
NNAS ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION WHICH IT (THEY?)  
COULD SUPPORT. ALTHOUGH THIS ALLY (THESE ALLIES?)  
SEE NO ADVANTAGE IN ALLIANCE ADVOCACY OF A MOVEMENTS  
CBM, IT (THEY?) RESERVE(S) ITS (THEIRS) POSITION  
ON QUESTION WHETHER UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES ALLIES  
MIGHT WISH TO CONSIDER INITIATIVES ON MOVEMENTS  
THEMSELVES, AS SOME ALLIES PROPOSE.

(L) PAGE 14, PARAGRAPH 30: AT END OF SENTENCE,  
SUBSTITUTE COMMA FOR PERIOD AND ADD "SINCE FINAL  
ACT GAVE SPECIFIC RECOGNITION TO THIS POSSIBILITY,  
I.E., 'FURTHER CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN...TO THE  
QUESTION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MILITARY MOVEMENTS,  
BEARING IN MIND, IN PARTICULAR, THE EXPERIENCE GAINED  
BY THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MEASURES WHICH ARE SET

FORTH IN THIS DOCUMENT'."

(M) PAGE 14, PARAGRAPH 3, SUB-PARAGRAPH (II): DROP

"WARSAW PACT" FROM THE FIRST LINE.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE

(N) PAGE SIXTEEN, PARAGRAPH 34 (1); LAST SENTENCE: SUBSTITUTE "WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES" FOR "SOVIET UNION". YUGOSLAVIA DOES NOT HAVE A BORDER WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION.

(O) PAGE 28: REVISE FIRST LINE TO READ, "...PROPOSAL WERE ADOPTED, AND IF THERE WERE NO SIZE THRESHOLD OR A VERY SMALL ONE, THE ALLIES MIGHT HAVE TO

NOTIFY A..."; ADD THE WORD "ALONE" AFTER "MOVEMENTS" IN LINE FOUR.

(P) PAGE 20, SUB-PARAGRAPH (12): AFTER "NEUTRAL COUNTRIES" IN THE SECOND SENTENCE, INSERT ", EXCEPT PERHAPS YUGOSLAVIA,".

(Q) PAGE 21, PARAGRAPH 37; LINE 13: FOR "CONCRETE", SUBSTITUTE "MORE AMBITIOUS ARMS CONTROL".

(R) PAGE 21, PARAGRAPH 37, FINAL SENTENCE: THIS SENTENCE IS ENTIRELY SPECULATIVE AND SHOULD BE DROPPED. FOLLOWING COULD BE SUBSTITUTED: "THE SOVIETS HAVE SHOWN SOME RECEPTIVITY TO THE POSSIBILITY OF STANDARDIZING TREATMENT OF OBSERVERS AND TO FURTHER DISCUSSION, AT SOME POINT, OF MOVEMENTS NOTIFICATION."

(S) PAGE 22, PARAGRAPH 40: IN LINE FOUR, REPLACE "OWN POOR" WITH "INFERIOR".

(T) PAGE 22, PARAGRAPH 43: AT THE END OF THE FIRST SENTENCE ADD THE PHRASE ", AS THE YUGOSLAVS AND THE ROMANISNS IN PARTICULAR HAVE ADVOCATED."

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE

(U) PAGE 22, PARAGRAPH 43: MISSION SHOULD RESERVE ITS POSITION ON LAST SENTENCE. FURTHER GUIDANCE WILL BE PROVIDED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

(V) "INITIATIVE(S)" SHOULD BE SUBSTITUTED FOR "PROPOSAL(S)" THROUGHOUT ISD/149 TO REFLECT CONCEPT PUT FORWARD IN PARAGRAPH F(2) OF REFTTEL G.

(W) WE DO NOT WISH AT THIS POINT TO CUT OFF COMPLETELY THE POSSIBILITY OF USING THE STATISTICS REFERRED TO UNDER FOOTNOTE (1) ON PAGES FOUR, SEVEN AND 22. WE WOULD THEREFORE REQUEST:

(1) SUBSTITUTING "IS INTENDED" FOR "SHOULD SERVE";

(2) ADDING "PROBABLY" BETWEEN "....IMPLEMENTATION

AND" AND "SHOULD NOT BE USED...;"

(3) DELETING "-OR EVEN SHOWN AT THE CONFERENCE TABLE-" (FIRST PART OF SENTENCE MAKES POINT ADEQUATELY); AND

(4) SUBSTITUTING "MIGHT CAUSE" FOR "COULD CAUSE SERIOUS".

(5) PLEASE MAKE FOLLOWING REVISIONS TO ISD/149 ANNEX II ON MILITARY EXCHANGES; ALL ARE ON PAGE 3, OTHER VISITS (1977):

(A) SHIFT VISIT TO POSTON BY REAR ADMIRAL KALININ

FROM 1977 TO 1975.

(B) DITTO WITH VISIT TO BOSTON BY SOVIET VESSELS BOYKIY AND ZHGOUCHIY  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 143453 POSS DUPE

(C) DITTO WITH VISIT TO CONSTANTA BY USS WAINWRIGHT

(D) DITTO WITH VISIT TO LENINGRAD BY REAR ADMIRAL LANGILLE.

(E) DITTO WITH VISIT TO LENINGRAD BY USS LEAHY AND USS TATTNAL

(F) ADD TO 1977 LISTING FOLLOWING TWO VISITS:  
USA ROMANIA 1-6 MAY VISIT TO BUCHAREST BY NDU/ICAF DEL.

USA USSR 11-18 MAY VISIT TO MOSCOW BY NWC DELEGATION.

VANCE UNQUOTE VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 22-Sep-1999 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** COLLECTIVE SECURITY AGREEMENTS, COMMITTEE MEETINGS, MILITARY CAPABILITIES, MISSILES  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 21-Jun-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977STATE143453  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** EUR/RPM:PBSWIERS  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D770220-0611  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t197706110/baaatbh.tel  
**Line Count:** 591  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 5c1e9e73-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ORIGIN EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 11  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02-Mar-2005 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 2012958  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> mcm 970909  
**Subject:** CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 21 POLADS MEETING  
**TAGS:** MARR, CSCE, NATO  
**To:** NATO PARIS MULTIPLE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/5c1e9e73-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009